MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION Type of Requestor: (X) HCP ()IE ()IC Response Timely Filed? (X) Yes ()No MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-5939-01 Surgical and Diagnostic Center, LP TWCC No.: 729 Bedford Euless Road West, Ste. 100 Hurst, TX 76053 Injured Employee's Name: Respondent Date of Injury: Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Rep. Box # 28 Employer's Name:

Insurance Carrier's No.:

PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT C-1-() P 1-1		
From	To	CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
4-29-03	4-29-03	62284, 72110	\$760.49	\$720.00
		Insurance carrier's payment (subtracted)		<\$666.00>
		Additional Amount Due		\$54.00

PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Our charges are fair and reasonable based on another insurance companies determination of fair and reasonable payments of 85 – 100% of our billed charges. Workers' Compensation carriers are subject to a duty of good faith and fair dealing in the process of worker's compensation claims.

PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

We base our payments on the Texas Fee Guidelines and the Texas Worker's Compensation Commission Acts and Rules.

PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to services provided in an Ambulatory Surgical Center that are not covered under a fee guideline for this date of service. Accordingly, the reimbursement determined through this dispute resolution process must reflect a fair and reasonable rate as directed by Commission Rule 134.1. This case involves a factual dispute about what is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services provided.

On 4-29-03, claimant underwent myelogram.

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it appears that neither the requestor nor the respondent provided convincing documentation that sufficiently discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that their purported amount is a fair and reasonable reimbursement (Rule 133.307). The failure to provide persuasive information that supports their proposed amounts makes rendering a decision difficult. After reviewing the services, the charges, and both parties' positions, it is determined that no other payment is due.

During the rule development process for facility guidelines, the Commission had contracted with Ingenix, a professional firm specializing in actuarial and health care information services, in order to secure data and information on reimbursement ranges for these types of services. The results of this analysis resulted in a recommended range for reimbursement for workers' compensation services provided in these facilities. In addition, we received information from both ASCs and insurance carriers in the recent rule revision process. While not controlling, we considered this information in order to find data related to commercial market payments for these services. This information provides a very good benchmark for determining the "fair and reasonable" reimbursement amount for the services in dispute.

To determine the amount due for this particular dispute, staff compared the procedures in this case to the amounts that would be within the reimbursement range recommended by the Ingenix study from 192.6% to 256.3% of Medicare for 2003). Staff considered the other

information submitted by the parties and the issues related to the specific procedures performed in this dispute. Based on this review and considering the similarity of the various procedures involved in this surgery, staff selected a reimbursement amount in the lower end of the Ingenix range. In addition, the reimbursement for the secondary procedures were reduced by 50% consistent with standard reimbursement approaches. The total amount was then presented to a staff team with health care provider billing and insurance adjusting experience. This team considered the recommended amount, discussed the facts of the individual case, and selected the appropriate "fair and reasonable" amount to be ordered in the final decision.

Based on the facts of this situation, the parties' positions, the Ingenix range for applicable procedures, and the consensus of other experienced staff members in Medical Review, we find that the fair and reasonable reimbursement amount for these services is \$720.00. Since the insurance carrier paid a total of \$666.00 for these services, the health care provider is entitled to an additional reimbursement in the amount of \$54.00

PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION AND ORDER

Based upon the review of the disputed healthcare services, the Medical Review Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement in the amount of \$54.00. The Division hereby **ORDERS** the insurance carrier to remit this amount plus all accrued interest due at the time of payment to the Requestor within 20-days of receipt of this Order.

Elizabeth Pickle

Authorized Signature

Elizabeth Pickle, RHIA

August 25, 2005

Typed Name

Date of Order

PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING

The party appealing the Division's Decision shall deliver a copy of their written request for a hearing to the opposing party involved in the dispute.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona in español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.

PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVERY CERTIFICATION

I hereby verify that I received a co	py of this Decision in the	Austin Representative's	s box.	
Signature of Insurance Carrier:	Mylen	Tox ?	Date:	9-7-05